

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 5-16 and 18-20 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1-6, 9-11, 14 and 16 have been rejected. Claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 15 and 17 have been objected to. Claims 3, 4 and 17 have been cancelled. Claims 18-20 have been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections and objections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laudato, Jr. in view of Zimmermann. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 25 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laudato, Jr. in view of Zimmermann, and further in view of Tawney et al. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laudato, Jr. in view of Zimmermann, and further in view of Schultz. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laudato, Jr. in view of Zimmermann, and further in view of Oh. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laudato, Jr. in view of Zimmermann, and further in view of Sorenson et al. Claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 15 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 17. The Examiner has previously indicated that claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, by incorporation of the limitations of dependent claim 17 into independent claim 1, the prior art rejections as to the other various claims are rendered moot. Applicant submits that each and every one of the claims presented that depend from claim 1 are in condition for allowance. Thus, there is no need to substantively traverse each and every prior art rejection set forth by the

Examiner nor, should Applicant's decision not to expressly traverse the various prior art combinations and applications suggest that the Applicant agrees with the position of the Examiner.

The drawings are currently objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). In response to this objection, the Applicant has amended rejected claim 3. Withdrawal of this objection is thus respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-2, 5-16, and 18-20 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: 

Terry L. Clark, Reg. No. 32,644
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

TLC/dab